

SIRPR

Original.
FILED - GR
March 18, 2016 12:48 PM
CLERK OF COURT
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
BY: mkg SCANNED BY: [signature]

IN THE United States District Court
for the District of Western Michigan

1:16-cv-282
Robert J. Jonker - Chief U.S. District Judge
Phillip J. Green - Magistrate Judge

Cheryl Marie,
of the Lynch family
c/o 19409 US 12
New Buffalo, MI 49117
269-815-8776
mpandcm@gmail.com
Plaintiff,

Complaint (Cause in Law)

Case No.

Michael Patrick,
of the Lynch family
c/o 19409 US 12
New Buffalo, MI 49117
269-815-8776
mpandcm@gmail.com
Co-plaintiff,

Demand for Trial by Jury

-against-

Bret Witkowski,
c/o 701 Main Street
St. Joseph, MI 49085
269-983-7111, Ext. 8645
Defendant

Basis of Diversity of Citizenship Jurisdiction and the Parties

COMES NOW Cheryl Marie and Michael Patrick, named at birth so by natural parents, and of the Lynch family together by bond of Holy Matrimony as is described in the family Bible, hereinafter "We, Our, Us", in Our own right.

1. There exists complete diversity of citizenship between Us and Bret Witkowski, hereinafter "Witkowski", per this Court's recognition of 28 U.S.C. §1332 jurisdiction.

We comprehend that the Court accepts a party's state of domicile as a settled presence in a place or per the law jurisdiction within which the party exercises self-obligations.

2. We are with chosen domicile in the Union state Michigan, the territorial land venue (the place) with physical land assets, wherein We exercise non-waived unalienable rights and full societal power to contract under natural-law jurisdiction, established and protected by “The Organic Laws of the United States of America”: Declaration of Independence, Articles of Confederation, Northwest Ordinance, and U.S. Constitution, per reference by the Congress as noted in the United States Code at Volume One.

Those Laws comprise current and permanent public law, having never been repealed.

We choose societal association as “free inhabitants”, which term is found within Article IV of the Articles of Confederation, the organic and extant societal compact between the people of the Union states. That says free inhabitants are entitled to the same privileges and immunities as citizens in the several states of the Union. We are states of being in fidelity to God first, God within, and to Mankind second, by imagining and speaking peace into Mankind. The “Laws of Nature's God” expressed in the First Organic Law, refers to the law of cause and effect as the natural state of law (natural law). As to Our standing, We exercise ministry full time in the societal sense of being natural-citizens, not within the context of 'organized religion'. We owe only expressions of loving reason to other people, and Our dutiful performance on the contracts We enter into knowingly, intentionally, voluntarily, with prior full disclosure of all consequences.

3. Defendant Witkowski has demonstrated that he is with domicile as a resident inhabitant in the County of Berrien, in the State of Michigan, a body corporate d.b.a. STATE OF MICHIGAN, hereinafter “STATE”, the federal / economic territorial venue (place) wherein private Public Policy (a.k.a. statutory law) jurisdiction operates relative to residents' applied-for privileges and proprietary assets. Our suit is against Witkowski in his individual capacity, not in his official capacity of Berrien County Treasurer.

4. This Court's constitutional Article III judge is with power to preside over this controversy between free inhabitants in the state Michigan, as plaintiffs, and a citizen in a completely different societal association – State of Michigan / STATE – as defendant.

Statement of Amount in Controversy

5. We deem that the harm done to Our rights and interests caused by defendant Witkowski's actions, omissions, and intentional conduct over time, as outlined herein this Complaint, justifies the actual and punitive monetary relief due to Us in the minimum value of \$200,000 not counting court costs.

Jury is Demanded

6. We plaintiffs hereby demand Our right of trial by jury, per Amendment VII of the U.S. Constitution, as to all the claims stated in this Complaint.

Reserved Right to Amend Complaint

7. We reserve the right to amend this Complaint upon receipt of the defendant's response.

Introduction of the Cause

8. This case in Law arises under The Organic Laws of the United States of America, hereinafter “Organic Laws”, which are also the governing laws within the matter that We present. The primary applicable laws are: adherence to *consent of the governed* referring to singular people as *all men are created equal*, the prohibition against *involuntary servitude*, and the prohibition against deprivation of liberty and property without *due process of law*. See Exhibit A, Organic Laws, U.S. Code.

9. We, the plaintiffs, seek the requested Relief for the harm of involuntary servitude caused by defendant Witkowski's deprivation of Our natural-law right and protected societal power as free inhabitants to exclusively control certain land, “Our Land”, in a free and independent Union state without providing Us Our demanded fundamental right to due process of law. This cause completely preempts any STATE tax matter.

10. We claim that defendant Witkowski has personally failed to provide Us the first essential of fundamental due process of law – notice of his claim upon which relief could be granted by Us. We demanded to be provided that notice of claim upon Our awareness of Witkowski's claim being pursued against Our Land in his official capacity

as county treasurer. We also initially provided Witkowski with a deed document per which We had recorded Our claim in the county's land-related records at Liber 2972 Page 3027. In that testamentary document We express what territorial venue Our Land is located within (the state Michigan) and that We control it by Our natural-law right (God-endowed dominion) and protected societal power as free inhabitants, as fact.

11. Witkowski failed to provide Us due process of law in his official capacity. He did not provide Us notice of his claim against Us with respect to Our Land, meaning the physical ground and everything attached to it. The only response to Our inquiry received from Witkowski in his official capacity referenced “property”, not Our Land.

12. The statute from which Witkowski functions in his official capacity states that it is “property” that is subject to property tax. Property means an attribute of something. It is a concept, not physical land. Property right and interest is that which can be attached with physical land. Land is attached with property by people choosing to do so. The tax statute would otherwise be in conflict with the Organic Laws protecting peoples' God-endowed unalienable liberty-rights and property-rights.

13. After Witkowski defaulted in official capacity (no notice of claim to Us), he continued to pursue the same tax collection claim in his individual capacity, acting outside the scope of his Office under color of STATE law, without providing Us due

process notice of his personal claim with respect to Our Land. Witkowski failed to personally provide Us notice of his tax-collection claim with respect to inclusion of Our Land. So Witkowski admitted, by default, in official and personal capacity, that he has no true basis in fact or law from which to demand tax money from Us or to act to remove Us from Our natural-law right and societal power to exclusively control Our Land in a free and independent Union state.

14. We have been denied fundamental due process of law, in violation of the Organic Laws that require due process due to Us. The word “process” means witness. Anyone making a claim is doing so based on the fact that his claim exists, and the fact is the witness of the self-obligation of the party being claimed against.

15. The claim Witkowski has been personally pursuing is based on his own bare allegations and beliefs that Our Land is land within the taxing jurisdiction: “*this* state”. The term “*this* state” is how the tax statute defines the economic territorial venue State of Michigan / STATE as being distinct from “*the* state” Michigan with geographically defined land boundaries. Witkowski has never been able to provide the basis in fact, from the two opening one-sentence sections of the tax statute, to support his belief or legal conclusion that Our Land is '*land within this state / STATE*'. The statute's opening paragraph, the enabling clause, expresses that “property rights and interests” is what is taxed, and 'property' is assessed per its market value when attached with physical land.

16. We have initially and consistently expressed to Witkowski, verbally and in writing, that We do not consent to hold monetized ownership of Our Land, and so Our natural-law right of exclusive control over it is intact.

17. We have arduously made good faith attempts to timely obtain relief from Witkowski's claim that he has failed to prove exists, to no avail.

18. Witkowski has committed wrongful acts, omissions, and intentional conduct that has resulted in Our involuntary servitude to Witkowski's capricious personal stance and his furthering of his self-interests.

19. Witkowski's past and ongoing wrongful and intentional conduct has caused Us to suffer harm, including but not limited to physical stress due to his extensive use of Our time, as a deprivation of Our liberty, which has been required for Us to hold him to his duty to provide Us relief from servitude. We have experienced loss of sleep from Our frustration due to the need of acquiring his acceptance of the truth per the numerous (well over 200) exchanged emails, plus conversations with him. Witkowski's devaluation of Our choice of God-directed societal association has caused insult to Our dignity per his attempts to compel Us into consenting to establish Our domicile in his statutory-law jurisdiction by applying for a tax exemption therein.

20. Added to Our emotional duress from Witkowski's threats made on Our right in Our Land and or money, We have experienced disappointment from his callous indifference of his omission of upholding Our fundamental rights by acting to correct the erroneous county records that defame Our character and Our Land. In his official capacity, Witkowski has the statutory authority to correct known-erroneous Forfeiture records, which records apply only to 'property', not to Our Land. The publication of a Forfeiture of real property for unpaid taxes constitutes public knowledge of a warrant for the arrest of the energy (in monetary-medium) of a criminal taxpayer who is refusing to meet his self-obligation shared with the other members of the public in the STATE (because the monetary assessment of property-value is equalized amongst all those participants). Witkowski has refused to perform that official ministerial function.

21. Witkowski has acted as though statutory law (which is clearly private contracting law) is public law (natural common law). Yet he insists on enforcing the tax statute under his special rules where he just assumes We understand that We are self-obligated, or We accept that all land must be taxed, so he has no need to provide Us notice of his claim. What he ignores is the fundamental right to due process We have if statutory law is really public law. Witkowski, as taxation claimant, has the burden of presenting the fact that such claim exists with respect to Us and Our Land.

22. We have committed no taxation crime. Witkowski has never presented the fact of

Our crime to Us. Witkowski is acting to force Us to pay him money (or agree to pay him money) to prevent his seizure of Our Land, so his adherence to fundamental due process is required. His pursuit of claim against Our Land use is deprivation of Our property-right in Our Land without just cause.

23. Witkowski's act of extracting money from Us without cause, in lieu of depriving Us of Our land-use, is no different than forcing Us to work for him for free for the time it takes Us to earn that amount of money. Servitude without just cause is involuntary servitude. The record shows that We have not volunteered to serve Witkowski's personal beliefs and interests beyond Our nominal charitable aid to help him understand the fundamentals as to Our chosen societal capacity and about Our Land (such as clarifying Our land claim document with him).

24. Witkowski's failure of duty to correct erroneous county records, thus allowing them to be re-used for tax assessing purposes, has contributed to township officers' cyclical continuance of trying to tax Our Land without any established authority to do so. Township officers have passed their presumptive claim with respect to Our Land onward to Witkowski who then personally asserts to Us that his official contract with the township justifies his demand for tax money from Us. We claim that Witkowski's personal demands for money from Us are in the guise of tax, as his abuse of his official position.

25. We have at all times maintained, and demanded, Our right to be provided with complete administrative relief from involuntary servitude, and the return of Our “non-tax” monetary-property Witkowski personally took on March 31, 2014 and converted to tax money by depositing it in his official capacity as treasurer.

26. The next tax-cycle year (collectable in 2015), Witkowski chose to withhold the 'parcel of property' from auction, because We refused to consent to his wrongful collection of money in the guise of a tax. We claim Witkowski only did so to limit his liability for the harm he was causing to Our interests (or his concern about liability). We further claim, Witkowski's reason for the withhold offer to “allow” Us to apply for a Homestead exemption was his act of coercing Us to consent to establishing Our 'domicile' within the STATE with use of Our Land. We told Witkowski, in the presence of a sheriff's deputy who accompanied him to Our house for a private meeting Witkowski set up with Us, that We had no intention or duty of applying for a benefit in the STATE. No STATE officer had presented the fact of such duty to Us.

27. This year, due to the harassing tax-collection notices Witkowski persists in sending to our location – addressed to a legal persona, not to Cheryl Marie or Michael Patrick – Witkowski has received emailed communications from Us informing him that We are without duty to engage with his collection demands and will not consent to pay 'tax'.

28. Witkowski could have acted during 2013 to cease pursuing his (and the township's) non-claim, based solely on the founded fact evidence of Our testamentary land claim document recorded in 2011 plus Our verbal expressions to him that We do not consent to Our Land to be taxed.

29. Witkowski's intentional mailing of tax-related notices to our location were solicitations to contract, and We had demanded that he stop sending them. Notices are not true bills. We specifically and plainly stated in a finalizing email to Witkowski on February 14th of this year that We do not consent to contract with him - as Treasurer - with Our use of Our Land as collateral for receipt of benefits (see paragraph 63 below).

30. We have since learned, right from Witkowski's mouth on February 29th, that he intends to leave the certain parcel of property that he personally attaches with Our Land on the auction list this year (unless We relinquish 'tax' funds to him by March 31st).

31. This lawsuit only addresses Witkowski's failure to provide Us Our initial fundamental right to due process of law. He has failed his duty to state a property-taxation obligation claim upon which relief can be granted by Cheryl Marie and Michael Patrick with respect to the certain physical land we control.

32. There is no conflict between the Organic Laws and the statute that Witkowski

operates in his official capacity. That statute applies to 'land within the STATE', placed there by consent of the people who rightly control physical land and freely choose to do so (since all people have free will choice in the matter).

33. The Organic Laws regarding due process govern this suit's proceedings, not statutory 'case law' as the authority or standard. Man-made statutes are just opinions on paper, with which concerned people agree or disagree. We, as plaintiffs, are not concerned with the statutes in the STATE – a venue foreign to Michigan natural-citizens (the people referenced in the Preamble to the Michigan constitution).

34. We do not fault anyone for choosing to trust in the statutory law venue (the communal-government model) for social guidance or protection of his/her societal interests. Our societal interests are protected by assurance We derive from placing Our trust in Creator God's law order that We socially minister – natural-law common to everyone, the committed use of which maintains a social condition of peaceful-coexistence. We claim We have been consequently subjected to involuntary servitude by Witkowski's reliance on the faulty opinion of STATE officers with whom Witkowski has consulted about this circumstance. Witkowski has stated to Us that they presumptively deem Us “Sovereign Citizens” (kooks), or people merely holding “anti-government” beliefs. We claim that Witkowski's Oath of Office requires him to act self-responsibly in fulfillment of his official duties. With the knowledge that

Witkowski has acquired from Us, per his voluntary engagement with it, We claim Witkowski cannot base his omission of acts to correct and/or cause the correction of false county tax records on the faulty opinions of any other officer.

35. Witkowski has evidenced, per the record spanning a long period of time, his callous disregard for Our rights and interests and the harm he has caused Us. We have extended God's grace to Witkowski, so that he could choose to redeem himself. But he remains with intent to steal Our rights or Our monetary-property. Witkowski's acts of subjecting Us to involuntary servitude, in all manifestations, violate the Organic Laws, which are clearly established laws to which he is socially and officially self-bound to adhere. We are now due the restoration of Our rightful condition, by obtaining judgment in Our favor and against Witkowski.

36. The only matter at issue before this Court is Witkowski's production of the proof of that he provided Us, or did not provide Us, Our fundamental right to due process of law regarding his claim that Our Land must be taxed as “real property within the STATE. That due 'process' is the founded fact witness (proof) under applicable law per which he claims that We had notice that Our Land is land within the STATE (as “real property”), and that We are self-obligated to pay tax for Our continued use of the land. Even after Witkowski's presentation of such claim to Us, We would be with right to examine the validity of the evidence he alleged as fact or of his conclusion of law. Only

upon proof of the mutual establishment of the fact that Witkowski's claim was valid could a tax on Our Land be now overdue. Our land claim document is the fact on record (dating from 2011) of Our eye-witness of the truth of the matter of where Our Land is located and how it is used by Us.

Statement of Documented Facts Relevant to All Claims

37. On September 24, 2012, We sent Treasurer Witkowski an email, received at 3:03 pm, as the followup he requested from a phone conversation We (via Cheryl Marie) had with him earlier that day. We had informed him that township officers had been pursuing taxation activity even though We timely required they provide Us the basis of their claim as to Our Land, and that they failed to provide any meaningful response. The email to Witkowski contained a synopsis of where Our Land is located, and where it is not, and also that We hold it in societal ministry. It called for county record correction by Witkowski, to prevent trespass by municipal (STATE) officers believing they have taxation duties to perform with respect to Our Land. The email contained an attached file with a scan of Our land claim deed document, which is found in the Berrien County records as Liber 2972 Page 3027. That record is attached as Exhibit B and fully incorporated herein in its entirety. It includes and overlays the Warranty Deed that taxing officers have identified as the source of their presumptive claim against Our Land. Our land claim is of primary importance. It is the founded fact evidence that

Our Land is in the territorial state Michigan under natural-law jurisdiction, and is not land within the federal economic territorial STATE under statutory law jurisdiction. Excerpts from that email to Witkowski follow, showing that We gave due notice of the facts to Witkowski and requested he take action to correct the county records (note: Our word “sureties” in this email excerpt means taxpayers). To Wit:

“Per our phone conversation this morning, I am providing you some primary documentation, as you requested, which will be of benefit to your understanding that the title pertaining to the right of possession (right-of-soil) of certain land is incorrectly categorized as being under the municipal public-trust and my husband and I are being categorized as the sureties. The invalid municipal PROPERTY numbers are ... 11-13-0019-0002-01-5.

We are the people referenced in the preamble to the Michigan Constitution. We do not trust in the Federal Reserve System districts; We are the people of the organic / extant State of Michigan who have never monetized divine birthrights; The land referenced herein has been claimed by us and never abandoned. The owner of the land is the Creator [God] of the land; We are beneficiaries of that divine property - “property” means use-right; Therefore, your office does not hold the position of trustee-owner of the use-right of possession; your office is hereby served from me and my husband, Michael Patrick...with good standing in the trust-capacity of ministerial-trustees in recorded trust directly under the Laws of Nature’s God (natural law) ... with the intent on our part to offer the opportunity of redemption of the ongoing trespass by many municipal-trust officers. We are duty-bound under our Sovereign [the Creator] to forgive the trespassers, and we only seek record-correction of land records. Michael Patrick and I have additionally placed clarification about our trust-standing into the Berrien County records via the Register of Deeds {see} Evidence-document #5.”

38. The only substantive response from Treasurer Witkowski was a one-sentence return-email on October 30th, 2012, at 3:54 pm expressing: “Only thing I show is 2011 taxes are owned on your property, and I read everything but not sure how my office is

involved. If the taxes are not paid in about 9 months we start personal visits.”

Witkowski's email implies that he equates 'land' with 'property'. That belief continued forward into 2013 and beyond.

39. During the end of 2012 We were also seeking meetings with township officers, so We focused on that governmental unit of the STATE to continue to obtain tax-record correction. Township officers refused to meet with Us, citing that no law required them to do so, and that they had no constitutional duty to do so either [which is not true; statute MCL 211.78 requires the due process notice to Us that We had demanded to be provided and were denied; We did not know about that statute at the time]. Their refusal to provide Us fundamental due process of law resulted in their creation of erroneous tax Forfeiture records with respect to Our Land, which have defamed Us and Our Land in public. We had to curtail Our frustrating efforts with them in order to again communicate with county Treasurer Witkowski who would directly act against Our Land in early 2014. We sent a couple of inquiring communications to him. The only substantive answer came by mail from Witkowski's official attorney at the time, Berrien County Corporate Counsel Donna Howard. In her letter of November 27, 2013, Howard wholly misstated the content and Witkowski's role relative to Us and Our Land that We had expressed in Our past detailed notices to him. She stated, in pertinent part, to “Michael P. Lynch” regarding “Your Property:” [showing the municipal address, where proprietary interests are moved by people associated in the STATE] and “Your

Parcel No.”:

“the written objections you recently submitted to the Treasurer seeking dismissal of the Treasurer's Foreclosure action as it relates to your property referenced above....have been reviewed and considered by [sic; the] Treasurer. In full consideration...we find your challenges to the validity and correctness of the forfeited unpaid delinquent taxes... has no merit in law or fact. As such, absent order from the Trial Court to the contrary the Treasurer will not be withholding this forfeited property from the above referenced Foreclosure action.”

Howard failed to include the founded fact evidence as the basis for her allegations and legal conclusion (obviously just assuming facts in evidence in support of her irrelevant position) that We were moving an “objection” for a “dismissal” for one thing, which was never stated by Us, and that Our communications to Witkowski pertained to “property” when We had stated to him the difference between land and property to identify that We are only concerned with land. We would never say “Our Property”. We felt devalued by Treasurer Witkowski, who was copied Howard's letter, disregarding Our societal capacity.

40. On December 9, 2013 at 11:40 am, We emailed Treasurer Witkowski a last notice about his duty to provide Us Our demanded fundamental right to due process of law in his official capacity. That email is attached as Exhibit C and fully incorporated herein as if stated in full. We have also included in the Exhibit the referenced Chart showing Public Trust relationships. That is a pictorial overview of the distinction between the state Michigan and the body corporate State of Michigan. Even if Our communications

with Witkowski had been somewhat confusing, this email and Chart should have been taken seriously enough for some movement to have occurred with respect to the due process We had been previously denied. This email also gives notice that mailings sent to Our location that concern 'property' matters have nothing to do with Us or Our Land, since no STATE officer has produced the founded fact evidence to support a claim otherwise. We are aware that certified mailings prior to a judicial Foreclosure of property are sent to satisfy the requirement of Notice that the treasurer must state on record that he has provided to property owners. So, this email informed Witkowski that he could not claim he had provided Us required notice or that he could threaten Our Land with his property proceedings. This makes clear that Our Land is not in shared-use with the public associated in the STATE. It ends by making clear to Witkowski that We are timely due his statement of claim against Our Land, and that his in-action has been causing Us loss of Our right of enjoying peace-of-mind. That authenticated email was faxed and mailed to Treasurer Witkowski.

41. We did not receive a response from Treasurer Witkowski. We deem that We had exhausted efforts to obtain administrative relief due from the Treasurer, per his failure to provide Us with Our fundamental right to due process of law under the principles expressed in the Organic Laws that govern everyone (as noted above at paragraph 8).

42. From January 2014 onward, defendant Witkowski acted in his individual capacity.

On January 21, 2014, We sent an email to Bret Witkowski, copied to the township's treasurer and county attorney Howard, received by them at 3:02 pm. This email is attached as Exhibit D and fully incorporated herein as if stated in full. It states that We have experienced involuntary servitude to Witkowski's interests due to the lack of due process. Since no founded claim against Our money or Land could exist, this email requests that Witkowski act within three days to abate the unwarranted foreclosure of the property (for the lack of attachment of Our Land with it). The email was sent on the day that Treasurer Witkowski conducted an official SHOW CAUSE hearing pertaining to property foreclosure matters. This further expresses that Witkowski will evidence that he is acting in personal capacity if he continues to believe that he is with right to overrule our will under cover of his Office.

43. Witkowski failed to withdraw his personal claim against Our Land, and continued to proclaim that Our Land is committed in attachment with a particular Parcel of Property. On March 13, 2014, We began what became almost continuous email exchanges with Witkowski, several per day. He was intending to demand money from Us or seize Our Land after March 31st. On March 13th at 4:47 We sent an email expressing that Our initial jurisdictional challenge must be satisfied by Witkowski (the email was copied to the township's treasurer). The following is the entire content:

“Now that you have been served to your own human-cognizance and to your official capacity as Treasurers, our recorded deed-document as to the effects of the presumptive taxation claim you are making that we and the land are 'in the

County' or 'in the State' as subdivisions of a Federal District (the survey subject to taxation), the only questions remaining for you to answer to restore the peace are:

Why has Parcel Number 11-13-0019-0002-01-5 remained on the tax rolls after we gave you notice of our recorded will and correcting Deed (of 2011) expressing that we do not exercise and have never intentionally exercised an 'ownership' claim as tenant in a Federal District? [As that 'ownership' use is dormant, the Parcel Number is also dormant.]

As office-holders under Oath, do you deny that people hold divine right-of-consent upheld by the law of the land, including the right to correct or require the correction of erroneous records?

Are you planning to seize our possession / equitable-use in this tract of land (including appurtenances), which we exercise as a statesman and stateswoman, unless we energize your taxation demand? If so, you must first prove that our land-use is in the Federal District jurisdiction.

These jurisdictional questions govern authority and power as to rights and obligations. You have never proved the jurisdictional foundation of your levy-action, and we have initially and consistently required that you do so. In the interest of justice you must prove your claim or quit your claim.

We now seek the honor of your immediate reply. We are without trust in your legal counsel (whomever), and are therefore without contract with him/her as the authority to answer for you. To anyone's cognizance of the public record, Berrien County Corporate Counsel Donna Howard has failed to provide the required jurisdictional or even the procedural basis of the levy-action proceedings against us and our land-use."

At 4:54 pm Witkowski emailed back: "As I mentioned before there is nothing that can be done at this point unless the tax is paid." At 5:00 pm We sent: "As we have made clear, until you prove the land is under taxable jurisdiction, your claim is invalid. Your computer printouts, or your speaking, or your counsel's speaking does not prove taxable jurisdiction." At 5:04 pm Witkowski emailed: "Just FYI last day to make a payment on

the 2011 taxes is March 31, 2014, if you are interested in a payment plan feel free to give me a call.” At 5:15 pm We stated: “Your offer for us to accept that you have taxable jurisdiction, by our appearing in your corporate jurisdiction to bargain with you as the trustees of a taxation-interest, is hereby Refused for Cause. We are unable to release our energy to fund any unverified claim.”

44. On March 14th, 2014, at 10:39 am Witkowski sent Us an email with a proffered payment plan, as his personal wrongful collection action. Without having provided Us Our initial right to due process of Law, the payment plan had no validity. Witkowski's proffered plan was expressed by him as follows: “For your property a payment of \$850 by 3/31/14 would postpone the foreclosure, let me know if this is something you are interested in doing.”

Here again, Witkowski refers to “your property”. He never says the word 'land'. We sent the following return-email, since We had to mitigate the harm to Our interests that Witkowski was intent on causing:

“Our good faith conditional-acceptance offer is stated quite clearly. We offer to enter into discussion allowing discovery of the jurisdictional basis of your claim that we are obligated to energize property taxation, prior to our commitment of any energy: *“We conditionally accept such time-out, only because it will require the preliminary establishment of jurisdiction for our energy to be committed to property taxation”*. That is all we can offer as response to an unverified claim.

Do you accept our good-faith offer?

You have caused this situation to be a very time-sensitive. We seek to contract with you (agree upon as equals) as to a date and time to meet for achieving settlement of this taxation-matter according with the rules of justice.

Your claim just made via returned-email, that you are with jurisdictional

authority and power to treat us as 'taxpayers', is invalid until you provide proof of jurisdiction to make such claim.”

45. On March 19th We emailed Witkowski the following at 11:01 am (excerpted):

“We have been requesting to schedule a necessary conference with you since March 13th. This email reiterates some of the details left per our voice-mail message to you yesterday (18th). This addresses the matter of your authority for you to proceed on your claim of the right to enforce the taxation-matter you have been moving. Per the rules of evidence, no one can be obligated to pay any tax that is not legitimately due and/or claimed as due by proper application of the law to a given set of facts. What facts can you prove to support application of the referenced law against us or our land? We seek a timely conference so that you shall not proceed to commit a taking of property without due process of law. The court’s ruling to permit your property-seizure proceedings against our land is invalid if your Petition did not present a cause of action that invoked the court’s subject-matter jurisdiction over our land-use for you to obtain the ruling; we have seen no evidence of facts supporting the purported factual-allegations made therein. We are with right to demand to be provided the sworn testimony of the competent witness (with first-hand knowledge) that you are relying on as proof of your claim that we owe a tax.

We do not know what you mean by your emailed statement to us of March 14 referencing “your property”. We do not know why we have to pay the tax that you are claiming we owe. We seek to discuss your evidence of supporting Facts. We believe there has been error about the fact that taxing jurisdiction exists as to us or our land. It appears that you have built inference upon inference to initiate and proceed on your claim. **The court order you have referenced, as somehow preventing you from taking correctional action, has no validity if there was no cause of action to begin with.** From our perusal of the legal verbiage in the property law statutes that you have referenced in documents as the jurisdictional authority (and the court’s authority), the law only applies to land that is “within the [legislative] jurisdiction of this state” [211.1 Property subject to taxation]. The word ‘this’ must be construed to limit the meaning of state, as compared to “the state”. It is not clear if ‘this’ means Michigan, or the State of Michigan. Why is it so vague? Why doesn’t it just say within “Michigan” or within “the state”, since the code does not apply to any other state? If all land is subject to property tax, why don’t they say it just like that in the law? How is that law adequate notice?

Your allegations of fact made within the documents you have placed on record (that we and/or the land are subject to the taxing jurisdiction) are correct if you can provide the testimony of the competent witness being relied upon to support

each allegation, and who can be cross-examined in living-voice. Your proof of claim ought to be readily available to provide to us for clarification about our obligations. If you cannot provide proof that your allegations are correct, then there is clear error as a matter of evidence and law, and you must immediately **record an error form into the record overcoming the notice of forfeiture.** You have no discretion in the matter of correcting error. If you must also record the foreclosure Judgment and then record an error form over that (because the Petition was void from the beginning as to the parcel/property 13-0019-0002-01-5), then perform that responsibility accordingly.

Since we are making every effort to prevent imminent irreparable harm – violation of our due-process right to not be defamed and deprived of property – it is now necessary to express to you that your failure to cooperate with our good faith investigation for straightening out this matter will create a reasonable presumption that anyone involved with the sale of the ‘property’ or the ‘parcel’ is involved in a fraud under color of law. Certainly you comprehend the fundamental that there is no official immunity for an officer who exceeds the authority of the Office, even if ‘acting in good faith belief’ that they have such authority. Due process is a principle of natural law, and all office-holders are with duty to serve that principle. The law commands, and we now demand, that you either, provide your verifiable proof that your claim is correct and we owe the tax, or else correct the error about the forfeiture.”

Witkowski returned Our email at 11:19 am with this non-response: “You are welcome to come by any time, but the only way to avoid losing the property due to back taxes is for either a judge to pull it out of the foreclosure process or for a partial payment to be paid as we discussed in an earlier email.” Witkowski only references “the property”, never Our Land. He completely ignored the content of Our communication of right.

We emailed him back, at 11:35 am with this return:

“You have now acknowledged your cognizance of receipt of our notice as an individual, and our service of it upon your duty of Office. You seem to presume, again, that we did not initially demand that you produce the proof of your jurisdictional authority to proceed on your claim as to the forfeiture and prior actions. It is your responsibility to engage with the court to correct a procedural error, if you choose to act honorably in Office.”

Witkowski's omission of honesty and accepting of self-responsibility has caused Us to feel extremely frustrated, as well as disappointed that this officer chooses to deny the fact that there has never been due process provided to Us. Feigned ignorance is a passive means of causing someone extreme duress, and that is what We felt during this physically and mentally stressful month of constantly trying to obtain the relief We were due by Law.

46. On March 24th, 2014 at 5:39 pm We sent Witkowski an email containing a simple question about his collection demand. He had sent Us the tax statute number per Our inquiry the day before about the law he means as pertaining to Our Land. So this is Our follow-up:

“Thanks for your quick reply to our question. We have another question for you just for clarification:

MCL 211.1 Sec. 1. Property subject to taxation. “That all property, real and personal, within the jurisdiction of this state, not expressly exempted, shall be subject to taxation.”

So, our question is, how do **you** know that **your** demand for payment from us is based on the lawful application upon **our land** (purported to be “Parcel” number 11-13-0019-0002-01-5) of the general property tax law at MCL 211.1?”

Witkowski's reply to that question was: “I'm not here to argue over state law that is for a court to decide if you feel different.” This recasting of Our right of inquiry into an argument on our part, or as a matter of Our feelings, is typical of Witkowski's attempted avoidance of taking self-responsibility for his wrongful collection activity. Redirecting the due process matter to an official other than him is another means he has employed.

47. On March 25th at 7:38 pm Witkowski tried to end the string of needful inquiries We were issuing by dismissing Us with: “Take care the offer is still there until 31 of march if not the property will be foreclosed on. Thanks and have a good week.” To that We replied at 8:57 pm:

“What '**property**' are you referencing will be foreclosed after March 31st? Would that be only the statutory 'Parcel' of property' referenced by a parcel number? Or, are you claiming that **our land possession** shall be adversely affected by your statement "the property will be foreclosed on"?

We have the **absolute right to inquire**, under our fundamental right of due process. You have the absolute duty to respond CLEARLY as to what you mean, in plain English so that any man can comprehend what you mean.

We have acted in good faith during this open hearing with you conducted via email. We offered to do so in a face-to-face meeting, and you chose the option of email which we had stipulated to accept. We have patiently attempted to reason with you to cause restoration of the peace that you are intentionally disturbing and threatening to irreparably disturb.

Do you choose to continue to breach God's peace and our societal rights, under color of law for your own gain? Do you choose to abuse and cause risk to your official position? Do you chose to bond your actions with your personal assets by acting outside the scope of your Office to coerce and/or extort money from us? Or, do you choose instead redemption of your acts, by acknowledging the Truth, per your utilization of your official Error forms.”

48. On March 26th Witkowski emailed Us at 8:33 am: “The parcel that will be foreclosed on march 31st is 13-0019-0002-01-5 address is 19409 US 12, unless minimum of \$850 is paid by the 3/3/14...”

We sent back this inquiry to that statement at 10:32 am: “How does the parcel number...that will be foreclosed on march 31st, and the “address 19409 US 12” pertain to **our land**? What **facts** are in evidence that allow you to claim **our land** is affected

by those legal terms and/or designations?” Witkowski did not respond, so We sent this conclusive notice as to his wrongful collection demand:

“If we understand you correctly, and especially per the fact of your non-response to our last very-simple question, we are with right to claim that you have no actual evidence of the lawfulness of your demand for any payment from **us** to reverse the seizure of **our land** and to prevent the sale of **our land**. Based on that fact, we are with right to claim that you are with intent to take [a.k.a. extort] energy from us in the medium of money in the amount-certain \$850 on or before the date-certain March 31st, 2014 C.E., being your willful violation of our fundamental due process rights.

Unless we do establish the required meeting-of-minds as to rights and obligations, on Friday (March 28th) we shall authenticate your proffered “Monthly Installment Payment Plan Agreement” under the condition of Threat, Duress, and Coercion that your actions have placed us, whether or not we make notation of that condition on the document that we authenticate, as the only means by which we can acquire peace-of-mind (also being our property) and the protection of our interests. That will leave you the lawful period of three calendar days before consummation of your extortion action done under color of law becomes binding – Midnight on March 31st.

If we remain without the answer to our question, on Friday we shall attempt to make an appointment with you, by contacting you first-thing in the morning, so that you can sign said Agreement in our presence on that day. We shall bring a postal Money Order for consummating our conditional acceptance of said Agreement in the minimum amount of our energy necessary to commit -- the \$850 -- per your demand made.”

49. On March 27th, 2014, We emailed Witkowski at 8:00 pm to confirm his personal **default**, causing us to involuntarily serve his interests, and the resulting harm. That email is attached as Exhibit E and is incorporated in the entirety as if fully stated herein. Also included is a sample of Our statements sent with Our “**non-tax**” **funds** extorted from Us by Witkowski, in the total amount of \$4,326.86. That document, which also

serves as public notice for and on the record, references Our societal capacity and that Our right to that wrongfully-collected money is protected by the Organic Laws.

50. At the end of 2012, the township appointed a new assessor. Upon Our discovery during April of 2013 that he intended to act with respect to Our Land, We phoned him and sought to be provided with the basis in fact and law upon which he relied to claim Our Land was “*real property in the Township*” per his words. We mailed a follow-up communication to him, dated April 21, 2013. That was also addressed to the township supervisor, and to defendant Witkowski who was indicated as copied; all three mailings were sent via Signature Confirmation. That communication was titled: “*Lawful assessment is precluded for violation of fundamental right to due process of law with respect to the Land purported to be 11-13-0019-0002-01-5.*” That sought the officers’ “competent witness that you **have been** relying upon to ground your allegation that the Land (including the building) is subject to the taxing jurisdiction indicated by you as “real property in the Township”. Absent proof on the record that the Land is within the taxing jurisdiction, the proof must be presumed not to exist.”

51. The only notice of claim We received from that assessor was his mailing to Us of a copy of the Warranty Deed with an arrow drawn to the metes and bounds description of “premises situated in the County of Berrien”, along with the first two pages of the tax statute with an arrow drawn to the word “land” within Sec. 211.2 near the bottom of the

first page and an arrow drawn on the second page to the provision pertaining to “owner” or “occupant” of “real property”. No cover letter from the assessor to Us was included; there was a letter therein from the township's attorney to the assessor dated June 23rd, copied to the township board. That correspondence did not include reference to Us or to Our Land or even to the property number purported by them to attach with Our Land. We therefore sent a notice back to the assessor on June 30th wherein We concluded that since he had not met his duty to state a claim against Us or Our Land, as We had demanded, his assessment activity was obviously done by error. We informed Witkowski of that event within a written communication We handed-delivered to him on June 11th, 2014. That assessor's error pertained to the 2012 tax-cycle Forfeiture recording. We stated therein to Witkowski: “You are advised that the erroneous Forfeiture [recording] is causing Us duress.” Treasurer Witkowski has the statutory authority, per MCL 211.78g(2) to cancel a discovered erroneous Forfeiture record. The treasurer can cancel a discovered erroneous Foreclosure Judgment too, per authority of statute MCL 211.78k(9)(e).

52. Witkowski failed to correct county taxation records, which would have mitigated the harm to Us. Near the 2014 year-end deadline for taxing officers to determine taxation rolls can be warranted (certified as valid and correct), We sent a final communication via Registered Mail to the township assessor, on December 20th, 2014, which was signed for by the township clerk for Assessor Roenicke. That recapped the

underlying failure of due process, and the fact of the “absolutely void assessment” of a parcel of property with respect to attachment of Our Land to it. The assessor did not respond. So, We continued the unsatisfied initial due process matter with defendant Witkowski in February of 2015. On January 28th, 2015, We sent Witkowski an email confirming the agreement We and he had entered into earlier that week, which was that We were not agreeing to enter into his official administrative 'Show Cause' hearing that he holds for tax-payment delinquent residents. We made it clear that he would be agreeing to enter into Our “Administrative Settlement Conference” (Our phrase for it) pertaining to his claim of a tax obligation on which he could perform collection with respect to Us and Our Land. The relevant cause (basis) of his claim had never been noticed to us. We also expressed that his failure to provide Us that essential notice by answering all of Our questions until the obligation is mutually agreed as being established, shall cause him the duty to cease his claim for the reason that there is no basis in fact or law to link Our Land with a 'parcel of property' in the STATE jurisdiction.

53. During the first week of February, via exchanged emails with Us, We tasked Witkowski to state his own claim (since he is the Claimant intent on causing Us more harm) against Our Land using the verbiage in the opening two one-sentence sections of the tax statute. Witkowski passed the task to the county's attorney. The attorney's responses were not responsive to Our questions; the attorney wrongly interpreted that

We were 'owners of real property'. So on February 3rd We sent an email to Witkowski containing the relevant follow-up questions that his attorney had not answered. That email is attached as Exhibit F, and the content is incorporated herein as if fully stated. The answers to the simple questions presented in that email are absolutely critical to establishment of Witkowski's authority to lawfully pursue collection of a tax with respect to Our Land. The enabling clause of the tax statute says that "property" (real or personal) is what is taxed, not land. Witkowski and the township's officers have indicated to Us that they just presume Our Land is "real property". Their personal stance does not provide Us fair notice of their claim, so that We can admit or deny the fact that their claim exists.

54. The next day, February 4th, Witkowski had to go into the judicial foreclosure proceeding on his Petition for Foreclosure of parcels of real property delinquent for unpaid taxes. While We were sending him emails pinning down Our ongoing pursuit of being provided Our fundamental right to due process of law relevant to Our natural-law right and protected societal power to exclusively control Our Land, Witkowski focused on pursuing Our consent to be taxpayers delinquent in tax payments on real property situated in the STATE governed by statutory law. He sent Us an email to that effect on February 3rd, as follows in its entirety:

Cheryl Marie and Michael

I respect all that you have said, but the local unit creates the tax, not the county, I become a gloried collection company. If you can work with me some I can work

with both of you, here is what I offer non homesteads which your property is listed as but I thought you lived in it, but that is between you and the township. On the 2012 taxes I ask that 15% be paid which is \$275 that would give you another year until March 31, 2016 to work out the situation with the township, or courts, or tax tribunal. It does not on your part admit to anything other than we are working together to allow you to resolve this matter. If you win through the courts, tribunal, or township then the money would be refund to you. Hope you understand my situation and willing to work with me.”

Witkowski's personal pursuit of his arbitrary and capricious determinations, blame of other officers, and pronouncements in furtherance of his own interests has caused Us extreme frustration of mind, and emotional stress. He says he hopes We will understand (stand under) his situation and are willing to work with him. He refuses to accept the truth – We are **not** situated where he is, the societal place. We do not choose to stand there. His complete denial of Our right to consent to freely associate and pursue Our creed and happiness and civic duties privately defies the founding principles upon which his own choice of communal-forum living depends. He could not answer Our simple question about how the township can “create the tax” as to Our Land, but insists the tax is created and the creation is the basis of his right to demand money from Us. He further deprives Us of Our natural-law right and Our societal power to exclusively control Our Land as free inhabitants in the free and independent state Michigan, by asserting that We must “win” permission from a judge to exercise Our God-endowed **unalienable** right to exist on physical land of the earth without first paying some man or mob to be able to do so. He says he respects what We have said, but the rest of what he says indicates that he ignores what We say.

55. We continued to hold Witkowski in a 'show cause' natural-law court session, so he could present the basis of his claim. He continued to press Us to commit to his payment offer, by emailing Us at 1:54 pm (still on February 3rd): "Want to make sure you got my email." We emailed back at 4:54 pm: "Do you intend to answer the questions we sent you this morning? What is 'real property'? You claim we have real property. You are offering that we pay a bond, but for what? To allow us time to prove we are NOT subject to the obligation you and the township officers are capriciously proclaiming?" Then at 11:02 pm Witkowski emailed Us again: "I am just getting back in tonight, I won't be able to get back until to you [sic] until late Wednesday or Thursday, I am sorry." The next morning, We sent an early message (because We routinely lose sleep over Witkowski's choices); at 5:13 am We emailed: "We are left wondering what you are intending to do today with respect to the truth...in court." After numerous further exchanges of emails, Witkowski informed Us that he routinely pulls parcels off the foreclosure list after the court proceeding, for various reasons. So that is where his opportunity to show Us the cause of his claim ended at that key juncture.

56. After a number of prodding emails on Our part, on February 17, 2015, We received an email from Witkowski stating that he had pulled "your property" from the foreclosure for this cycle. Although that was somewhat relieving to Us, the reason why he did so was to coerce Us into changing our domicile from Our chosen place of being. His email continued:

“You are correct on ceasing foreclosure for valid reasons, I do have that authority. As to your property I already pulled it from foreclosure for this cycle yesterday on my day off I know it is your homestead and I am willing for you to use the processes in place to see what you can do about past taxes. But please respect my belief that I have and others have in the law that I don’t have the authority to remove the tax for 2012, 13 and I assume 2014. Again I would suggest for 2015 filing a poverty exemption with the township. As to the other years there are steps in place through the state to address those past taxes, and I think even the 2014 taxes could be handled at the township also.”

Witkowski admits he is acting from his own belief, and choice of law forums. But he continues to proclaim to “know” that We are residents IN his BELIEF system who owe fealty to the king who governs in that realm. We have never asked him to “remove the tax” for any year. What tax? We have been seeking from him how and why We got bound to pay a tax, or, how the body-corporate STATE got all the physical land from the Union state Michigan such that all physical land must be taxed without Our consent.

We responded: “Bret, **you**, and only you, are the **Claimant** as to **your claim**. We are without duty to disprove your claim, nor is it possible to prove a negative. **We are not claimants**. Our beliefs have nothing to do with your claim. Only your beliefs have to do with your claim.” We added that he can perform the cancellation of the erroneous foreclosure judgments in the county records because: “Your movement of an invalid claim is a valid reason to cease moving it, right?” Our email closed with a reminder that: Since *'all men are created equal'*, no man or group of men can compel us to place Our Land within or consent that Our Land is “within the jurisdiction of this state” per the man-made statute MCL 211.1 and 211.2 applicable only to taxation. A Right cannot

be converted to a privilege for the purpose of taxing the Right.”

57. On February 23rd (2015), Witkowski sent Us an email stating that he had read over Our past emails, and he asked Us if it would be possible to meet, possibly in New Buffalo (nearer to Our house). We emailed back, inquiring about the agenda, as specifically as he could describe. We invited him to meet Us at Our house. He replied: “So I can get a better understanding is my goal.” He agreed to meet at Our house.

58. We met with Witkowski at Our house the evening of March 3rd, 2015. Earlier that day We emailed him Our written agenda, outlining the unsatisfied jurisdictional matter. He agreed to that agenda. It centered on his duty to provide Us with constitutional due process of law (not process according to statutory law, until and if We all had agreement that statutory law governs the circumstance). A sheriff's deputy accompanies him to meetings, so We met a nice man introduced as Les who witnessed Our lengthy and amicable meeting. We went over the verbiage in the tax statute. Witkowski could not produce any fact supporting his claim, nor even state a claim linking Our Land with real property. We brought the Organic Laws to bear on Our right in Our Land, and stated that that the tax statute would conflict with the Organic Laws if peoples' right of consenting to monetize or not monetize their land use was not protected; there is no conflict between the laws. We expressed that the Organic Laws protect his official right

and duty to acknowledge that people can choose to control land in a private way, or else in a publicly-shared proprietary way termed a 'property right and interest'. Witkowski examined a copy of Our land claim (deed) document that overlays the Warranty Deed. We said the property interest (which is contracted for when people consent to pay property tax) is dormant (at least temporarily) now that We control this land. But We made certain that Witkowski realized that We were not meeting to prove anything. He was the one making a claim against Our Land. We addressed his statutory authority to cancel erroneous Forfeiture and Foreclosure Judgment records. Since the county treasurer is responsible for the accuracy of tax collection on behalf of the STATE, the Legislature gives the Office of Treasurer that correcting power. We informed him that he must stop moving a false claim, and return Our “non-tax” funds he took the year before, and must stop depriving Us of Our rights and societal power per his personal denial. We reminded him that We already made known that We do not consent to monetize Our Land use to acquire publicly-offered governmental benefits. He took it all in, and participated in the conversation. Les was also very attentive. Still, near the end of the meeting, Witkowski restated what he had already said via email – that he was withholding the “property” from foreclosure to allow Us to obtain a Homestead exemption. To that offer, We gave Witkowski emphatic notice that We were without intention and duty to obtain anything at all from the STATE.

59. The next substantive communication We had with Witkowski took place on May

6th (2015) per another meeting that he requested. We had exchanged emails to that point that had produced no relief for Us from Witkowski's ongoing deprivation of Our rights and involuntary servitude to his interests. We do not know what his motivation was for calling the meeting, other than to try to convince Us to quit seeking relief from him. The meeting took place at the New Buffalo Township Public Library. We later produced a full written recap of the meeting and emailed that to Witkowski, on May 11th, per his request to receive it. Witkowski was offered the opportunity to challenge any of the numerated points therein. We did not receive any rebuttal or suggested additions from him. The recap is attached as Exhibit G, and the enumerated content on pages 4-6 therein is incorporated herein as if fully stated. A principal matter expressed therein is Our demand for the return of Our "non-tax" funds taken by Witkowski in March of 2014. The other matter is Our demand for Witkowski's termination of his acts to deny Us Our rights and subjugate Us into serving his personal beliefs and interests. We attempted to impress upon him that the township's officers had no authority to pass the taxation matter on to him (per their failure to provide Us due process), as the fact he might contemplate or investigate with them directly. Witkowski acknowledged that he received that recap email.

60. On June 1st 2015 a mailing arrived at Our location showing that Witkowski had filed another Petition for Foreclosure on the property that he personally attaches to Our Land. We sent him an email the same day, noticing him in both of his capacities that

We did not consent to contract with him incapacity of trustees of a property tax matter.

61. On June 5th, We received an email from Witkowski pertaining to a mutual but distant acquaintance of Ours and of his becoming involved to act as an informal mediator. We agreed, clarifying that the man would act only as a messenger, and not in any representative role. We started copying the mediator into certain emailed exchanges with Witkowski. The focus from Our end remained on the unsatisfied jurisdictional matter, requiring settlement for Witkowski's lack of a claim.

62. The mediator's help did produce a needful result. The mediator encouraged Witkowski to provide the township supervisor with a particular document that We had earlier sent to Witkowski. That pertained to the basis of jurisdiction necessary for claiming Our Land could be taxed. We learned that Witkowski did choose to present the document to the supervisor. She then left Witkowski a text-message stating, in effect, that the township could not ground their authority, because she said she did not know what Witkowski was talking about. No matter how such a statement can be interpreted, given how much communication We had had with and provided to township officers, none of them could be relied upon to have passed a lawful tax claim to Witkowski with respect to Our Land without realizing We were challenging their right to do so. The mediator informed Us that this event occurred. In spite of that knowledge gained by Witkowski, he persisted to move his false claim into 2016.

63. On February 14th and 16th, 2016, We sent emails to Witkowski about the seriousness of lying to the foreclosure court judge about constitutional due process requirements having been met in full as to all parties affected by the proceeding. The last matters of fact that We stressed are as follows:

“People must contract via consenting to land-use as the collateral for obtaining benefits (private law privileges) from your corporation; the assessed tax is simply the consideration.

You know that **we** - Cheryl Marie and Michael Patrick - have **never** received Notice of the tax **obligation** claim you are moving in collection. You know that the LYNCH MICHAEL is a fiction. You know that a fiction cannot pay a tax, or contract relative to a tax. You know that we have not consented to our land to be taxed for receipt of public privileges. You are the officer who is responsible to the State for the lawful collection of taxes. You cannot claim that Township officers are forcing you to move their claim. You cannot pretend that you do not understand that you are violating these clearly established laws:

- 1) All men are created equal
- 2) Informed and voluntary consent is required to establish an obligation (per 'consent of the governed')
- 3) Subjecting anyone to involuntary servitude is prohibited (compelling us to occupy the status of “resident” or “owner” / “occupant” of a parcel of real property violates our fundamental right to freely associate and to steward physical land)”.

64. On February 29th, 2016, We met briefly with Witkowski at his office and learned that he is personally intent on stealing more of Our monetary-property or else stealing Our Land, under the guise of a tax collection that he knows or should know is a wrongful act. He has in the past, and intends to continue to willfully deprive Us of Our natural-law right and protected societal power as free inhabitants to exclusively control

Our Land in a free and independent Union state without providing Us Our demanded fundamental right to due process of law.

Damages

As a result of the defendant's actions, omissions, and intentional conduct outlined and detailed above, plaintiffs sustained the damages herein before alleged.

Requested Relief

Therefore, plaintiffs Cheryl Marie and Michael Patrick, of the Lynch family, ask this Court to enter judgment against defendant Witkowski, and award damages as follows:

- Compensatory and punitive damages in an amount to be determined at trial, based on the minimum value of \$200,000 that We deem is just;
- Injunctive relief for consequential damages, requiring erroneous taxation records maintained in the County of Berrien pertaining to Parcel of Property number 11-13-0019-0002-01-5 be corrected to reflect that the testamentary land-claim deed document recorded at Liber 2972 Page 3027 overlays the correlated Warranty Deed at Liber 2898 Page 498;
- Allowable costs; and
- Such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

Plaintiffs' authentications of the foregoing being true and correct follow below:

Acting in my ministerial right as a free inhabitant in the land jurisdiction Michigan, without the federal United States and State of Michigan / STATE OF MICHIGAN, with all my societal powers reserved and protected by The Organic Laws of the United States of America, and, absent accommodation or acceptance of any representative-status or any privilege/benefit, and without grant of power-of-attorney to any person (artificial or otherwise), and without prejudice, and without intent of trespass, I authorize the foregoing as the author and issuer thereof, and, my yea be yea and my no be no:

this day: March 17, 2016

I AM *Cheryl Marie: seal*

this day: March 17, 2016

I AM *Michael Patrick: seal.*

of the Lynch family

Cheryl Marie and Michael Patrick, *of the Lynch family*

c/o 19409 US 12, New Buffalo, MI 49117

269/815-8776

mpandcm@gmail.com